

JONATHAN W. BROWN, ESQ. (State Bar No. 223901)  
LIPSITZ GREEN SCIME CAMBRIA LLP  
42 Delaware Avenue, Suite 120  
Buffalo, New York 14202-3924  
(716) 849-1333  
Facsimile No.: (716) 849-1315  
[jbrown@lglaw.com](mailto:jbrown@lglaw.com)

MARK S. HOFFMAN, ESQ. (State Bar No. 108400)  
MARK S. HOFFMAN, A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
11845 W. Olympic Blvd., Suite 1000  
Los Angeles, CA 90064  
Tel. (424) 248-6633  
Fax: (424) 248-6677  
[mark@markshoffmanlaw.com](mailto:mark@markshoffmanlaw.com)

Attorneys for Plaintiff LFP IP, LLC

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
**CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

**LFP IP, LLC,**

Plaintiff,

vs.

**LEE KEITH BRETT,**

Defendant.

Case No.: cv 16-166 FFM

The Hon. Frederick F. Mumm

**[Proposed] FINAL PRETRIAL  
CONFERENCE ORDER**

**Final Status Conference: September 13,  
2018**

**First Day of Trial: October 2, 2018**

**FINAL PRETRIAL CONFERENCE ORDER**

1 Following pretrial proceedings, pursuant to F.R.Civ.P. 16 and L.R. 16, IT IS  
2 ORDERED:  
3

4 1. The parties are: Plaintiff LFP IP, LLC (“Plaintiff”), and  
5 Defendant Lee Keith Brett (“Defendant”).  
6

7 Each of these parties has been served and has appeared. All other  
8 parties named in the pleadings and not identified in the preceding paragraph are  
9 now dismissed.  
10

11 The pleadings which raise the issues are:  
12

13 The Complaint filed by Plaintiff on January 8, 2016 (Doc. 1);  
14

15 and  
16

17 the Answer filed by Defendant on August 3, 2016 (Doc. 23)  
18  
19

20 2. Federal jurisdiction and venue are invoked upon the grounds:  
21 Plaintiff seeks injunctive relief under 15 U.S.C. § 1051, *et seq.* (the “Lanham  
22 Act”), and this Court has subject matter jurisdiction of this action pursuant to 28  
23 U.S.C. §§ 1331; 1332; 1338 and 1367; 15 U.S.C. § 1125(a); and 15 U.S.C. §  
24 1121. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1391 (b) and (c).  
25  
26  
27

28 3. The trial is estimated to take 2 trial days.

1  
2 4. The trial is to be a non-jury trial.

3 At least seven (7) days prior to the trial date the parties shall file and serve  
4 by e-mail, fax or personal delivery the findings of fact and conclusions of law the  
5 party expects the Court to make upon proof at the time of trial required by L.R.  
6 52-1.  
7  
8  
9

10 5. The following facts are admitted and require no proof:  
11

12  
13 (1) Plaintiff LFP IP, LLC (“Plaintiff”) is a Delaware limited liability  
14 company authorized to do business in the State of California.  
15

16  
17 (2) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
18 on February 25, 2003 for “clothing, namely, beach wear, blouses, coats,  
19 coveralls, dresses, head wear, jackets, jeans, jogging suits, jumpers, leg  
20 warmers, leggings, lingerie, lounge wear, neckwear, pants, scarves, shirts,  
21 ski wear, slacks, sleep wear, tank tops, socks, vests” in International Class  
22 25 (U.S. Reg. No. 2689852).  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 (3) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER HOLLYWOOD service mark  
28

1 that was registered on April 2, 2013 for “[r]etail store services featuring  
2 digital video discs, adult sexual stimulation aids, apparel, lingerie, hats,  
3 cosmetics, candles, perfumes, shave creams, bath and body products,  
4 personal lubricants, body creams, novelty items, party games, playing  
5 cards, candies, jewelry, books, magazines, condoms, and lotions” in  
6 International Class 35 (U.S. Reg. 4312312).  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 (4) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
12 on May 20, 1975 for “entertainment magazine” in International Class 16  
13 (U.S. Reg. 1011001).  
14  
15

16 (5) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER TV trademark that was  
17 registered on October 25, 2005 for “[c]able, satellite, television and video-  
18 on-demand (VOD) broadcasting” in International Class 38 (U.S. Reg.  
19 3008950).  
20  
21  
22

23 (6) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
24 on January 28, 2003 for “men's and women's jewelry, namely, rings,  
25 necklaces, bracelets, [ watches ]” in International Class 14 and “glassware,  
26 namely, shot glasses, mugs, beer steins” in International Class 21 (U.S.  
27  
28

1 Reg. 2679483).

2  
3  
4 (7) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
5 on December 4, 2007 for “[g]arments for pets” in International Class 18  
6 (U.S. Reg. 3349195).

7  
8  
9  
10 (8) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
11 on February 15, 2011 for “[m]otorcycle helmets” in International Class 9.  
12 (U.S. Reg. 3918404).

13  
14  
15 (9) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
16 on December 24, 2013 for “[e]yewear, namely, sunglasses; Protective gear  
17 for motorcycle riding, namely, motorcycle gloves for protecting hands in  
18 an accident and motorcycle goggles” in International Class 9. (U.S. Reg.  
19 4453481).

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 (10) Plaintiff is the owner of a HUSTLER trademark that was registered  
25 on June 18, 2013 for “[b]ackpacks; Duffel bags; Handbags; Messenger  
26 bags; Purses; Tote bags; Travel bags; Wallets” in International Class 18.  
27 (U.S. Reg. 4354035).

1  
2 (11) Defendant Lee Keith Brett (“Defendant”) is an individual that  
3 resides in Clay Center, Kansas.  
4

5  
6 (12) Defendant operates a website with the domain name  
7 <AmericanHustlerClothing.com>  
8

9  
10 (13) Defendant purchased the <AmericanHustlerClothing.com> domain  
11 name on or about May 7, 2015.  
12

13  
14 (14) Defendant filed a trademark application on June 10, 2015, for an  
15 AMERICAN HUSTLER service mark (Serial No. 86657943) for “[o]n-  
16 line retail stores services featuring clothing and billiard products” in  
17 International Class 35.  
18

19  
20 (15) During the application process, Defendant disclaimed any exclusive  
21 right to use “AMERICAN” apart from the mark as shown.  
22

23  
24 (16) On October 22, 2015, the United States Patent and Trademark  
25 Office (“USPTO”) issued an Office Action refusing Defendant’s  
26  
27  
28

1 AMERICAN HUSTLER application based upon the likelihood of  
2 confusion with three of Plaintiff's Registered Marks (specifically, U.S.  
3 Reg. Nos. 2689852, 4268341, and 4312312).  
4

5  
6  
7 (17) On December 8, 2015, Defendant responded to the October 22, 2015  
8 Office Action.  
9

10  
11 (18) On January 10, 2016, the USPTO issued a Final Office Action again  
12 refusing Defendant's AMERICAN HUSTLER application based upon the  
13 likelihood of confusion with Plaintiff's Registered Marks (specifically,  
14 U.S. Reg. Nos. 2689852, 4268341, and 4312312).  
15  
16

17  
18 (19) On June 22, 2016, prior to this preliminary conclusion being fully  
19 adjudicated, the USPTO suspended action on Defendant's AMERICAN  
20 HUSTLER application pending termination of this civil proceeding and the  
21 refusal for likelihood of confusion with Plaintiff's Registered Marks was  
22 continued as non-final.  
23  
24

25  
26 (20) LFP, IP is not the exclusive trademark owner of the word "hustler."  
27 For example, Cigar Hustler reg. no. 4337913 is not owned by LFP, IP.  
28

1 (21) LFP, IP has not conducted a survey.  
2  
3

4 6. The following facts, though stipulated, shall be without prejudice to  
5 any evidentiary objection: N/A  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 **7. Plaintiff:**  
11

12 (a) Plaintiff plans to pursue the following claims against the following  
13 defendant:  
14

15 Claim 1: Defendant infringed Plaintiff's Registered Trademark(s) by  
16 promoting, advertising, preparing to distribute and/or selling "American  
17 Hustler" branded clothing items (15 U.S.C. § 1114(a)).  
18  
19

20 Claim 2: Defendant, in connection with the sale of t-shirts, used the  
21 term "American Hustler" in a false or misleading way which is likely to  
22 cause confusion, or to cause mistake, or to deceive as to the affiliation,  
23 connection or association between Defendant and Plaintiff, or as to the  
24 origin, sponsorship or approval of Defendant's t-shirts or commercial  
25 activities by Plaintiff (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)).  
26  
27  
28



The elements required to establish Plaintiff's claims are:

Claim 1: Infringement of Plaintiff's Registered Trademark

A trademark is any word, name, symbol, device, or any combination thereof, used by a person to identify and distinguish that person's goods from those of others and to indicate the source of the goods.

In this case, Plaintiff contends that the Defendant has infringed Plaintiff's trademark(s). Plaintiff has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that:

(1) HUSTLER® and/or HUSTLER HOLLYWOOD® are valid, protectable trademarks;

(2) Plaintiff owns the HUSTLER® and/or HUSTLER HOLLYWOOD® trademarks; and

(3) Defendant used the "American Hustler" mark on his goods, without the consent of the Plaintiff, in a manner that is likely to cause confusion among ordinary purchasers as to the source of the goods.

AUTHORITY: Ninth Circuit Manual of Model Jury Instructions, §15.1[modified] and §15.5 [modified].

1        Claim 2:     Federal Unfair Competition / False Designation of Origin

2        Plaintiff has the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence  
3  
4        that:

5        (1)     The HUSTLER® and/or HUSTLER HOLLYWOOD® trademarks  
6  
7        are valid, protectable marks;

8        (2)     Plaintiff owns the claimed trademarks;

9  
10       (3)     Defendant used the “American Hustler” mark, without the consent  
11       of Plaintiff, in a manner that is likely to cause confusion among ordinary  
12       consumers as to the source, sponsorship, affiliation or approval of the  
13  
14       goods.

15       AUTHORITY: 15 U.S.C. §1125 (a)  
16  
17  
18  
19

20       In brief, the key evidence Plaintiff relies on for each of the claims is:

21       1.     Plaintiff’s Federal Trademark and Service Mark Registrations  
22       (Plaintiff owns various HUSTLER® trademark registrations for various  
23       goods and services, including but not limited to an incontestable  
24       registration for apparel items, including shirts. Plaintiff also owns the  
25       HUSTLER HOLLYWOOD® service mark for a chain of retail stores that  
26       feature various items for sale, including but not limited to HUSTLER®  
27  
28

1 branded t-shirts and HUSTLER® branded merchandise).

2  
3  
4 2. Examples of Plaintiff LFP's T-Shirts (various designs that Plaintiff  
5 has sold over the years, some that feature the American flag and the slogan  
6 "Hardcore Since '74").  
7

8  
9  
10 3. Defendant's various T-Shirt Designs (among other things,  
11 Defendant's t-shirt designs that feature "Hustler" prominently, designs that  
12 feature the year 1974, and using words such "original").  
13  
14

15 4. The USPTO's rejection of Defendant's "American Hustler" service  
16 mark application on a Section 2(d) likelihood of confusion refusal basis  
17 with respect to several registrations owned by Plaintiff.  
18  
19  
20

21 5. Defendant's website that features various "American Hustler" t-shirt  
22 designs.  
23  
24  
25

26 **Defendant:**  
27

28 (a) Defendant plans to pursue the following counterclaims and

1 affirmative defenses:

2 Pursuant to the meet and confer process with LFP's counsel, and based in  
3 particular on LFP's counsel's representations that it will not pursue a claim for  
4 damages, and has withdrawn and will not pursue its Third and Fourth Claims  
5 asserted in the Complaint, Mr. Brett will not pursue at trial the following defenses  
6 previously asserted in Mr. Brett's answer, affirmative defenses and counterclaims  
7 are withdrawn: 1) estoppel; 2) license; 3) laches; 4) waiver; 5) failure to state a  
8 claim; 6) mitigation of damages. On August 3, Mr. Brett withdrew two  
9 counterclaims asserted in the Answer. *See* ECF No. 30.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14

15 (b) The elements required to establish Defendant's counterclaims and  
16 affirmative defenses are: See response to (a) above.  
17  
18  
19

20 (c) In brief, the key evidence Defendant relies on for each counterclaim  
21 and affirmative defense is: See response to (a) above.  
22  
23  
24

25 8. In view of the admitted facts and the elements required to establish  
26 the claims, counterclaims and affirmative defenses, the following issues remain  
27 to be tried: (1) whether Defendant used the "American Hustler" mark on his  
28

1 goods, without the consent of the Plaintiff, in a manner that is likely to cause  
2 confusion among ordinary purchasers as to the source of the goods; and (2)  
3 Defendant used the “American Hustler” mark, without the consent of Plaintiff,  
4 in a manner that is likely to cause confusion among ordinary consumers as to the  
5 source, sponsorship, affiliation or approval of the goods  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10

11 9. All discovery is complete.  
12  
13

14 10. All disclosures under F.R.Civ.P. 26(a)(3) have been made.  
15

16 The joint exhibit list of the parties has been filed under separate cover as  
17 required by L.R. 16-6.1.  
18

19 Pursuant to the Civil Trial Order issued on June 26, 2018, the parties shall  
20 meet and confer and prepare the Final Pre-Trial Exhibit Stipulation for filing on  
21 September 25, 2018.  
22  
23

24 11. Witness lists of the parties have been filed with the Court.  
25

26 Only the witnesses identified in the lists will be permitted to testify (other  
27 than solely for impeachment).  
28

1  
2  
3 12. The following law and motion matters and motions in limine, and no  
4 others, are pending or contemplated: N/A.  
5  
6  
7

8 13. Bifurcation of the following issues for trial is ordered: None.  
9  
10

11 14. The foregoing admissions having been made by the parties, and the  
12 parties having specified the foregoing issues remaining to be litigated, this Final  
13 Pretrial Conference Order shall supersede the pleadings and govern the course  
14 of the trial of this cause, unless modified to prevent manifest injustice.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2018.  
20  
21

22 \_\_\_\_\_  
23 U.S. DISTRICT MAGISTRATE JUDGE  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

1  
2  
3 Approved as to form and content.

4 *Attorneys for Plaintiff LFP IP, LLC:*

5  
6 LIPSITZ GREEN SCIME CAMBRIA LLP

7  
8 By: /s/Jonathan W. Brown  
Jonathan W. Brown, Esq.

9  
10 *Attorneys for Defendant Lee Keith Brett:*

11  
12 McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

13  
14 By: /s/ Jodi L. Benassi  
Jodi L. Benassi, Esq.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 **SIGNATURE ATTESTATION**

20 Pursuant to Local Rule 5-4.3.4, I hereby attest that all other signatories  
21 listed, and on whose behalf the filing is submitted, concur in the filing's content  
22 and have authorized the filing.

23 By: /s/Jonathan W. Brown

24 Jonathan W. Brown  
25 Attorney for Plaintiff  
LFP IP, LLC